

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 577

HE 031 768

AUTHOR Border, Charles B.; Barba, William C.
TITLE Graduate Student Support and the Graduate Education Experience. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (23rd, Miami, FL, November 5-8, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; *Assistantships; Doctoral Degrees; *Educational Experience; Fellowships; *Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Questionnaires; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; *Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; State University of New York Buffalo

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between the type, amount, and sequencing of institutional funding for graduate students and students' perceptions of the impact of such financial assistance in their persisting to the completion of degree requirements. A total of 295 Ph.D. recipients from the University of Buffalo in New York who received their degrees between 1975 and 1993 completed a 54-item questionnaire on the type of support received, the outcomes and experiences attributed to the graduate education experience, and opinions about those outcomes and experiences. It was found that financial support with a service commitment afforded graduate students the opportunity to have a much fuller graduate school experience. Students with a service requirement graduated sooner, had more traditional academic experiences during their graduate student careers, and felt that their graduate experiences as a whole were much richer than did students who received financial support without a service requirement. Eighty percent of the respondents reported that an assistantship or fellowship provided them with specific skills that they would not have obtained otherwise. Two appendixes contain a copy of the questionnaire and accompanying letter sent to prospective participants. (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 427 577

Graduate Student Support and the Graduate Education Experience

Charles B. Border
Genesee Community College
cbborder@sunygenesee.cc.ny.us

William C. Barba
State University of New York at Buffalo

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Vaughan
ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

HE 031 768

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Miami, Florida, November 5-8, 1998. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract:

Very little systematic investigation has been done regarding the relationship between the type, amount or sequencing of institutional funding for supported graduate students, and the student's perception of the impact of such financial assistance in their persisting to the completion of degree requirements, particularly to writing a dissertation. This study employed a self-reporting survey instrument to gather information from 295 Ph.D. recipients from a mid-western AAU university regarding the relationship between the experiences and outcomes they experienced in graduate school and the level, type, and sequencing of financial support. Respondents to the survey overwhelmingly supported the idea that financial support with a service requirement gave them the opportunity to have a much richer graduate experience than support that carried no required service.

Graduate Student Support and the Graduate Education Experience

When the German research idea was transported across the Atlantic during the later decades of the Nineteenth Century, the whole scope of American higher education was transformed from one which taught existing knowledge and developed proper God-fearing conduct, to a system which stressed the creation of new knowledge. The development of Graduate education was a part of this transformation and has become a major mission at many institutions. Yet after more than a century, the administration of graduate education is neither as well understood nor as centrally organized as undergraduate education (Bowen and Rudenstine, 1992).¹

Where it exists, most literature regarding graduate education deals with the reputational ranking of programs (Malaney, 1987), and time to degree studies (Bowen and Rudenstine, 1992). Very little systematic investigation has been done regarding the type, amount or sequencing of institutional funding for supported graduate students, and the student's perception of the impact of such financial assistance in persisting to the completion of degree requirements, particularly to writing a dissertation. This study employed a self-reporting survey instrument to gather information from 295 Ph.D. recipients from the University at Buffalo regarding the relationship between the experiences and outcomes they had had in graduate school and level, type, and sequencing of financial support. Respondents to the survey overwhelming supported the idea that financial support with a service requirement gave them the opportunity to have a much richer graduate experience than support that carried no required service.

Literature Review

There have been several very interesting studies of the type, sequencing, goals and outcomes of graduate student support.

Most major graduate programs in the US subscribe to the belief that effective institutional support relieves the financial burden from a graduate student and allows that student to concentrate more fully on their studies. Several studies have suggested for some time that a fellowship is the "best" form of financial support for those graduate students thought to be most promising (Goldberg, 1984, Nerad and Cerny 1991, and Froomkin, 1983). Since fellowships with no institutional service requirement are used generally to recruit top graduate students, they are highly prized in most graduate programs. If, however, the fellow is not as involved in a particular graduate program through their service commitment as those students holding assistantships (with a service commitment), and therefore does not benefit

¹ The admissions process is illustrative of the contrast between the role of central administration in undergraduate and graduate education. At most major research intensive universities in the US undergraduate admissions is centrally administered by an admissions department staffed with specially trained admissions counselors. The admission of graduate students, particularly doctoral students, is administered in a completely different fashion; it is considered a sacred responsibility reserved to departments and graduate programs, not to any administrative office.

from the socializing influence which institutional service can provide, then new graduate students might benefit more from an assistantship than such a non-service fellowship (Girves and Wemmerus, 1988, p.187.) The validity of this assumption, however, has not been thoroughly tested, particularly in any longitudinal cohort study. (Bowen and Rudenstine, 1993). In many studies, however, the same institutional support can increase the probability that students who have completed all their degree requirements (are ABD) may not complete their degree or at best such support can significantly lengthen a doctoral students' time in residence (Malaney, et al).

A recent research survey of almost 800 arts and sciences doctoral students at Rutgers University discovered that although assistantships and fellowships affect time to degree, these sources of income have no special direct impact on progress to degree given the students level of income from all sources. (Gillingham, et. al. 1991, p.460) This finding differs from earlier research by Girves and Wemmerus (1988) who maintained that a teaching or research assistantship reduces the time to degree in the doctoral programs which they examined. Moreover, Bowen and Rudenstine found that some students holding only fellowships which required no service in exchange for support "may have found it easier to become isolated or even lost...without collaborators and some modicum of structure." (Bowen and Rudenstine, p.188). and therefore increased their time to degree.

Girves and Wemmerus determined that more research is necessary to investigate the type of financial support provided to doctoral students. "Fellows, teaching assistants and research assistants all engage in very different activities which may affect the extent of their socialization and involvement and ultimately their degree progress." (p.187).

Moreover, such full-time doctoral candidates add to the instructional, research, and administrative component of that graduate program or department. In more and more institutions graduate students, along with adjunct faculty, provide a significant portion of the instruction offered.

Such support is also perceived by faculty as a means to assist graduate students in the transformation to a particular discipline or field of study. It has clearly become the norm, however, in many major graduate institutions, to grant institutional support to the best doctoral students, based upon past academic performance and GRE scores.

Some recent research has determined that the form of financial support is not as important as has been commonly supposed. In fact, as Bowen and Rudenstine discovered, students in English, History, and Political Science, supported mainly on fellowships (with no service requirement) have not had consistently higher completion rates than students who relied more heavily on teaching assistantships (which required service) (p. 178).

Since graduate education is a very expensive undertaking for both the institution and the student, it is surprising how little theoretical or empirical research has been done in the area. It is also apparent from the literature that there is not enough flexibility in the types of graduate student funding at most institutions. As we face the economic woes of American higher

education in the late-1990's, it is critical that institutions examine the packaging, pacing, and precise allocation of financial aid available to graduate students. The present study attempts to analyze this area from the perspective of a major public AAU institution.

Research Issues

There are several impediments to the systematic investigation of graduate student support. The first of which relates to a lack of a consistent terminology across institutions, almost every university employs somewhat different terminology and expectations regarding teaching, research, and graduate assistantships and fellowships. One cannot assume the same expectations from institution to institution; in fact, the expectations of Teaching Assistants (TA's), Research Assistants (RA's), and Graduate Assistants (GA's) differ considerably not only by institution but also by discipline within a given institution (Ethington and Pisani, 1993).

A second impediment to the systematic study of graduate student support has been a lack of adequate administrative information on past degree recipients. Unlike undergraduate administrative records which are seen as strategically valuable systems to be used for student tracking by many groups on campus and therefore are kept up to date. The administration of graduate programs is largely viewed as a departmental issue and therefore much less emphasis is placed on the maintenance of administrative record systems. At many institutions this has resulted in their not being kept as accurate and up-to-date. The lack of up-to-date administrative records has made conducting research on a large enough sample of doctoral degree recipients very difficult. In response much of the research that has been conducted on graduate student issues has centered around the use of present doctoral students as proxies for past degree recipients.

A final impediment has been the difficulty of specifying the financial support with precision given to an individual graduate student. Graduate students often receive multiple sources of support from several different budget categories from semester to semester. For most graduate students, receiving some institutional base financial support is the most important issue; the form and source of that support is secondary.

The present study emanated from several observations regarding graduate education at major research intensive universities. The baseline assumption of many institutional support programs is that institutional financial support alleviates a student's financial concerns and therefore allows the student the opportunity to become immersed in a graduate program to an extent not otherwise possible.

The second interest was in attempting to distinguish the educational and socializing values of different forms of institutional financial support offered to most doctoral students. Specifically, what professional tasks, values, attitudes, and mores does involvement in each graduate experience provide? A TA, RA or GA may have different, yet complementary experiences. University fellows, with no formal responsibilities, on the other hand, may well have entirely different graduate experiences.

A third area of concern deals with the timing and sequencing of financial support. Is there a "best" time to offer different forms of aid, or more precisely, is there an optimal time to offer support which requires the student provide some service in exchange for that support (teaching assistants, graduate assistants, or research assistants), and conversely, is there an optimal time to offer support which does not require the student provide some services in exchange for that support (fellowship support)?

Method

Given the above research issues it was determined that a case study of a major research intensive AAU institution would be the most valuable way to address these questions. Due to its large and multifaceted graduate program the University at Buffalo was chosen as an ideal case study to examine the issues of the impact of institutional financial support on graduate student persistence to degree completion.

The University at Buffalo is the largest institution in the 64-campus State University of New York system and is a comprehensive graduate and professional center maintaining graduate programs at the doctoral and first professional level. It supports doctoral programs in the Arts and Sciences, Dental Medicine, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Management, Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Nursing and Pharmacy. The institution maintains professional programs in several fields such as Architecture and Planning, Dental Medicine, Information and Library Studies, Law, Management, Medicine, and Pharmacy.

Our intent was to survey all Ph.D. recipients from the institution over an 18 year period, 1975-1993. Name and address information was received in label format from the University Alumni Office. Recipients of first professional degrees (i.e., DDS, Ed.D., D. Pharm, JD, and MD) were not contacted since such individuals rarely receive institutional support in the form of assistantships or fellowships.

To keep the cost of administering the survey down, all graduates with permanent addresses outside the US were excluded. It should be noted that although updated centrally, there were a number of problems with the currency of addresses, with persons who changed names due to marriage or divorce, and other identification issues which arose, including obsolete addresses. In all 43 surveys were returned by the post office as undeliverable.

Participants:

This research employed a survey instrument to measure the perceived outcomes of doctoral students graduate education experience and the type of support they received during their graduate education experience. Surveys were sent to 940 Ph.D. degree recipients from 1975-1993. Completed, valid surveys were returned by 295 respondents for a response rate of 31%. Tables 1, 2 and 3 detail some of the more important descriptive information about the respondents to the Graduate Education Survey. Respondents reported beginning their graduate programs in a fairly evenly distributed fashion throughout the period, and were generally representative of the institution in terms

of their major field of study with the largest groups coming from the Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The average self-reported time to degree varied from 10 semesters in Education to 15.9 semesters in Social Sciences.

Table 1.

Year Graduate Education Begun	Number	Percentages
Blank	14	4.7%
1975-1980	63	21.4%
1981-1985	130	44.0%
1986-1990	84	28.5%
1991-1993	4	1.4%
Total N:	295	100%

Table 2

FACULTY	Major Field of Study	Totals:	Percentages
	Blank	10	3.4%
AAL	Arts and Letters	49	16.6%
EAS	Engineering	55	18.6%
EDS	Education	1	.3%
MG	Management	14	4.7%
NSM	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	73	24.6%
SSA	Social Sciences	93	31.5%
Totals:		295	100%

Table 3. Number of Semesters Attended

FACULTY		N/A	< 11	11 -15	16 -20	21 - 25	> 25	Totals:	Average
	Blank	7	1	2				10	10.7
AAL	Arts and Letters	8	10	18	9	1	3	48	14.1
EAS	Engineering	7	22	20	5		1	55	11.4
EDS	Education		1					1	10.0
MG	Management	3	1	5	5			14	15.2
NSM	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	11	9	42	7	3	1	71	13.2
SSA	Social Sciences	17	18	25	18	7	8	93	15.9
Totals:		53	62	112	44	11	13	295	13.9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instrument:

A self-reporting survey instrument (Appendix A) developed by the researchers was used for the study. The fifty-four items selected for inclusion in the instrument were based on the extent literature and the experience of the researchers. The questions contained in the survey concentrated on three main areas: the type of support received by the student, the outcomes and experiences the student attributed to their graduate education experience, and the opinions the student had about those outcomes and experiences. The instrument contained a mixed format with some responses based on Likert type scales and others asking for comments and fill in the blank type answers. Due to the continuing involvement of many Ph.D. recipients with the University at Buffalo and our desire to obtain the most honest responses to the survey, all responses were anonymous and no questions were asked which could be used to identify the respondent.

Procedure:

Surveys were mailed to 940 Ph.D. recipients in the spring of 1994 with a cover letter and postage paid return envelope. The cover letter (Appendix B) stated that we were interested in the respondent's perspective on the relationship between the experiences and outcomes they had had in graduate school and the level, type and sequencing of financial support.

Responses to the survey were transformed to enable us to better refine our hypotheses and aid in analysis in three fundamental ways. In the survey respondents were asked what types of financial support they had received in each of their first five years of graduate study. The responses pointed to the fact that students received many different types of support and from one year to the next and there was little consistency in the type of support received.

In response to this we recoded the respondents into two groups, those who had received institutional support that required service (TAs, GAs, RAs) and those who received support with no service requirement (fellows, outside employment, and other). Since our primary research goal was to look at the outcomes and experiences that respondents reported from their graduate education, we also included in the no service requirement group those respondents who reported receiving support that required service for only one year. The above transformation resulted in the following distribution; Support With Service Requirement, $n=237$, Support Without Service Requirement, $n= 53$, No Response, $n= 5$, Total $n= 295$.

A second transformation that was performed involved the development of scale scores for the Experiences and Outcomes questions. Each question was divided into two parts, the first part asked whether a student had had a particular experience (such as the responsibility to teach a course, or be engaged in a funded research project) or attributed a particular outcome to their graduate program (such as improved conceptual scores, or, writing skills) (all experience and outcome questions were worded as positive statements, scale scores Yes=1, No=0). Scale scores were developed by summing the responses to

the individual questions. The scale scores, in effect, became counters of the number of experiences or outcomes each respondent reported having. The larger the scale score the more experiences or outcomes the respondent reported having.

The second part of each question asked whether the respondent's service requirement contributed to the opportunity to have that experience or outcome (scale scores; Blank=0, Did not contribute=1, Very little=2, Moderately=3, Significantly=4, Would not have had this experience=5). The Experience (or Outcome) Likert scale scores for each respondent equal the sum of the individual Likert scale codes. This means that those who had a high Likert scale score attributed more of the opportunity to have more of the experiences or outcomes that they reported to their graduate service requirement.

Results:

The respondents to this survey overwhelmingly supported the idea that financial support with a service requirement gave graduate students the opportunity to have a much richer graduate experience than support that carried no institutional service requirement. Students who received financial support which required some form of service to the university reported having had more favorable experiences, more favorable outcomes, and received their doctoral degrees faster than those students who received support with no service requirement.

This research sought to address the perceived difference graduate student support with a work or service requirement had in effecting the outcomes, experiences and time to degree of doctoral students. This was operationalized by developing a series of eight hypotheses, each of which addressed a slightly different side of this issue. An alpha level of .1 was used for all statistical tests.

By utilizing the self-reported time to degree (TTD) and support information we found that respondents who reported receiving support with a service requirement (SSR) had a TTD ($M=13.5$, $SD=5.24$) significantly lower than those who received support without a service requirement (SWOSR) ($M=15.39$, $SD=5.73$), $t(58)=-2$, $p<.05$. Although this may seem counterintuitive, it implies that the time students spent providing service to the institution in exchange for their financial assistance was time well spent. This finding is in line with those of Girves and Wemmerus who also reported a lower average TTD for students with a service requirement as part of their institutional support.

We also wanted to examine any relationship between the type of support received and the outcomes and experiences the respondents reported. By utilizing the scale scores for outcomes and experiences we found that students who reported receiving support with a service requirement had a higher scale score for both outcomes (SSR, $M=10.48$, $SD=3.08$) (SWOSR, $M=9.56$, $SD=3.37$), $t(72)=1.82$, $p<.05$, and experiences (SSR, $M=13.98$, $SD=3.77$) (SWOSR, $M=12.54$, $SD=3.60$), $t(79)=2.6$, $p<.05$. Students who were required to perform a service in exchange for their assistance reported that they had more positive experiences and more positive outcomes from their graduate experience than those who were not. Once again this may seem counterintuitive if the service

performed is seen as, at best, a mindless activity. If one looks more closely at the types of services that students perform and think of it as an apprenticeship for future academicians one gets a better idea of the results. When graduate assistants help to assemble a survey with a faculty member or when teaching assistants run a recitation session in support of a faculty member they are learning about the life of an academic in a very practical manner. Students who received support with no service requirement missed out on this type of experience.

To further test the relationship between TTD and outcomes and experiences we divided the respondents into quartiles based on their scores on the Experience and Outcomes scales. The mean TTD was then calculated for each quartile and a One-Way ANOVA was performed to see if there was a significantly large difference between the means to conclude that those respondents who reported having more traditional academic experiences and outcomes had a shortened TTD. Only with the scale score for experiences did this prove to be correct (Between Groups, $df=3$, $MS=60.50$, Within Groups, $df=238$, $MS=28.10$, $F=2.15$, $p<.1$). The mean scale scores for Outcomes for the different quartiles were not different enough to conclude that the TTD of students who had a higher Outcome scale score was shorter than the TTD of students with a lower scale score (Between Groups, $df=3$, $MS=12.16$, Within Groups, $df=238$, $MS=28.71$, $F=.4237$). These results may be more an artifact of the wording of the questions asked than the impact of a service requirement on the graduate education experience students. It would be highly unusual for a student without a formal service requirement tied to their graduate support to have some of the experiences outlined in the survey (e.g. teaching a class, or recitation). On the other hand it would not be as unlikely for the same students to report the outcomes discussed (e.g. improved conceptual or writing skills).

We next wanted to see if there was a relationship between scores on the Outcome scale and the Experience scale. To test this a correlation test between the two scale scores was conducted. A significant positive relationship between the two scales (Experience, $M=13.6$, $SD=3.80$, Outcome, $M=10.31$, $SD=3.14$, $r=.4267$, $p<.001$) was found, suggesting that students who experienced more during their graduate experience got more from the overall experience. This test points, in a very direct way, to the idea that students who were more involved with their institution through their service activities felt that their overall graduate experience was more valuable to them and that they got more from it.

Finally, we sought to determine if respondents associated the opportunity to have the experiences and outcomes that they reported to the service requirement they performed. We tested the hypothesis that there was a relationship between a respondents Likert scale score for experiences and outcomes and their experiences or outcome scales scores. Significant positive relationships for both the Outcome (OutLikert, $M=29.63$, $SD=17.26$, Outcome, $M=10.31$, $SD=3.14$, $r=.5060$, $p<.001$) and Experience (ExpLikert, $M=38.08$, $SD=20.77$, Experience, $M=12.85$, $SD=3.61$, $r=.4875$, $p<.001$) scales were found. This analysis points to the idea that respondents who reported having had more

experiences (or outcomes) attributed more of the opportunity to have had those experiences (or outcomes) to their service requirement.

Discussion and Conclusions:

It is clear from the results of this survey that financial support with a service commitment affords graduate students the opportunity to have a much fuller, richer graduate school experience. Although this may seem counter intuitive, given the normal practice of awarding support with no service requirement to our brightest, most promising graduate students in the hope of alleviating them from the drudgery and time spent away from studying of assistantship tasks, each of the statistical analyses performed pointed to a service requirement as adding an extra dimension to student's overall graduate school experience. The importance of having a service requirement attached to the financial assistance received by students came across in the analysis in several different areas: Students with a service requirement graduated sooner, they had more traditional academic experiences during their graduate career, and they felt that their graduate experience, as a whole, was much richer.

The importance of the service commitment throughout the students graduate experience was confirmed by answers given to a series of questions asked as part of the survey but not included in the previous analysis.

- 86% of respondents reported that their assistantship or fellowship allowed them to continue their education beyond an undergraduate degree.
- 78% of respondents reported that the offer of financial assistance was of major importance in their decision to attend graduate school or they would not have attended without it.
- 74% reported that their assistantship or fellowship moderately or significantly aided in their adjustment to graduate school.
- 80% reported that their assistantship or fellowship provided them with specific skills that they would not have received otherwise.
- 68% reported that their assistantship positively influenced their academic performance.
- 64% reported that the service responsibility of their assistantship either shortened or had no affect on their progress to degree.
- 72% reported that even if money was no object to an incoming student they would encourage them to seek an assistantship or fellowship anyway.
- 86% reported that work or service should be a requirement of all those holding an assistantship.

These results and our previous analysis point to the incredible importance of the service requirement in the life of a graduate student. In many ways graduate school is very much akin to an apprenticeship in that the graduate students learn background knowledge in their classroom experience, but in working side by side with faculty members in their field they are able to learn by doing. Through their service requirement they are exposed in a way that is impossible in the classroom to exactly what it is like to be a teacher and researcher in their field and it is this experience that our respondents reported had the most impact on their later careers.

The graduate education experience is a rich area for future research. Many of the ideas and assumptions undergirding the way that we educate our graduate students have never been exposed to the type of careful evaluation which we routinely use on subjects away from the academe. Although this case study is limited by its small sample of recent Ph.D. recipients drawn from only one institution it is an important step in gaining a better understanding of this very complex area which should be followed up by other similar studies.

References:

Bowen, W.G. & Rudenstine, N.L. (1992) In pursuit of the Ph.D. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ethington, C. A. & Pisani, A. (1993) The RA and TA experience: Impediments and benefits to graduate study. Research In Higher Education, Vol. 34, No. 3 343-354.

Froomkin, J. (Ed.). (1992) The crisis in higher education. New York: Academy of Political Science.

Gillingham, L., Seneca, J., Tausig, M., (1991) The determinants of progress to the doctoral degree. Research in Higher Education, 32 August, 449-468.

Girves, J.E. & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate degree progress. Journal of Higher Education, 59, No. 2, March/April 163-189.

Goldberg, M. (1984). The essential points of a nation at risk. Educational Leadership, 41 (March 1984) pp. 15-17.

Malaney, G. (1987, November). A decade of research on graduate students: A review of the literature in academic journals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore, MD.

Nerad, M. & Cerny, J. (1991) From facts to action: Expanding the educational role of the graduate division. CGS Communicator: Council of Graduate Schools. May.

THE GRADUATE EDUCATION EXPERIENCE

Appendix A

1. What was your highest degree expectation when you first enrolled in graduate school at UB?

No degree aspirations,
taking selected courses only _____

Masters
Degree _____

Doctoral
Degree _____

Other degree,
please specify _____
2. Semester and year you first enrolled as a graduate student at UB _____
3. Did you ever apply for an assistantship or fellowship at UB?

No _____ (Go to Question 5)

Yes _____ (Continue to Question 4)
4. How important was UB's offer of financial assistance in your decision to attend UB?

No offer in my initial semester
Minor importance _____

Major importance
Would not have attended without it _____

5. Please check each type of appointment that you held for as many as five calendar years of graduate study. Also indicate the work commitment that each position required or expected. If more than one type of appointment was held in the same year, please check all that apply.

Year of Study	Type of University Appointment				Employment Outside the University	Total Work Requirement (e.g., 10 hours/week; 20 hours/week; teach 1 course; teach 2 courses; no work requirement, etc.)
	None	TA	RA	GA	Fellowship	Other
First	—	—	—	—	—	—
Second	—	—	—	—	—	—
Third	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fourth	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fifth	—	—	—	—	—	—

6. Listed below are experiences that you may have had while a graduate student at UB. Please circle (1) whether or not you had each of these experiences at UB and (2) for those experiences that you had, the degree to which you believe your assistantship(s) and/or fellowship(s) contributed to your *opportunity* to have these experiences. Those who did not hold an assistantship or fellowship while at UB should answer the "HAD THIS EXPERIENCE" column only. Those who held more than one type of position should draw on all positions when answering.

Degree to which assistantship(s) and/or fellowship(s) contributed to my *opportunity* to have this experience

D - Did not contribute
L - Very Little
M - Moderately
S - Significantly
W - Would not have had this experience

Had This
Experience

Yes No

Experiences:

Had sole or primary responsibility for teaching a course
Had responsibility for a recitation or laboratory section
Assisted a faculty member by grading papers, tutoring etc.

Advised undergraduate students
Served on a departmental or faculty/school committee
Attended department co-curricular activities (i.e., seminars, brown bag lunches)

Socialized regularly with graduate students in my department
Attended a social event in the home of one of my professors
Sought advice from one or more faculty members in my department

Had conversations which helped clarify my goals with one or more faculty
Was treated as a junior colleague by faculty members
Had a faculty mentor

Was actively engaged in a funded research project
Helped write or was involved in writing a research proposal
Submitted a paper for publication (whether or not it was accepted)

Had creative activity recognized at public recital or showing
Was an author of a published research paper
Attended a meeting of my professional association

Delivered a paper at a meeting of my professional association
Developed a network of friends with whom I discussed professional interests
Felt as if I was part of my academic department

7. Below are several outcomes or changes that may have occurred to you as a result of your graduate education at UB. Please circle (1) whether or not you believe each outcome or change occurred and (2) for those changes that did occur, the degree to which you believe that your assistantship(s) and/or fellowship(s) *contributed* to the change. For those who did not hold an assistantship or fellowship while at UB, please answer only the "THIS OUTCOME/CHANGE OCCURRED" column. Those who held more than one type of position should draw on all of these positions when answering.

Educational Outcomes and Changes:	Degree to which assistantship or fellowship <i>contributed</i> to this change		This Outcome/Change Occurred		D = did not contribute L = very little M = moderately S = significantly W = Would not have had this change	
	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Improved my conceptual skills	Y	N			D	L M S W
Improved my writing skills	Y	N			D	L M S W
Improved my public speaking ability	Y	N			D	L M S W
Developed strong teaching skills	Y	N			D	L M S W
Developed strong research/methodology skills	Y	N			D	L M S W
Improved my time management skills	Y	N			D	L M S W
Increased my capacity for self-criticism	Y	N			D	L M S W
Improved my ability to relate theory and practice	Y	N			D	L M S W
Increased my knowledge of issues in my discipline/field	Y	N			D	L M S W
Clarified my professional objectives	Y	N			D	L M S W
Increased my understanding of different philosophies and cultures	Y	N			D	L M S W
Broadened my view of my discipline and my career interests	Y	N			D	L M S W
Focused my view of my discipline and my career interests	Y	N			D	L M S W

8. Should all graduate students be offered an assistantship or fellowship at some point in their graduate education? Yes _____ No _____
9. Should all doctoral students be required to teach a course as part of their degree requirements? Yes _____ No _____
10. Semester and year you received your highest graduate degree from UB _____
11. Major department/program _____
12. Current occupation, if employed _____

THIS SECTION IS ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO HELD ASSISTANTSHIP(S) AND/OR FELLOWSHIP(S) AT UB.

Those who did not hold either appointment have completed the survey. Thank you for your time and interest in graduate education at UB.

13. My Assistantship(s)/Fellowship(s) - Please answer a,b, and c.
- | | | |
|--|------------|---------------|
| a. Allowed me to continue my education beyond my undergraduate degree | Yes | No |
| b. Aided in my adjustment to graduate school | Not at all | Moderately |
| c. Aided in my adjustment from graduate school to employment (if employed) | Not at all | Moderately |
| | | Significantly |
14. Did your assistantship or fellowship provide specific skills that you would not have received otherwise? Yes _____ No _____
- We encourage you to provide specific examples of ways in which your assistantship or fellowship enhanced your graduate education experience
- _____
- _____

15. How did your assistantship responsibilities influence your academic performance? Negatively _____ Not at all _____ Positively _____

16. How did the service responsibility of your assistantship affect your progress toward your degree?

Shortened Time to Degree _____ No Affect _____ Lengthened Time to Degree _____

17. Would a dissertation year fellowship which carried no service requirement have allowed you to complete your degree in less time?

Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

18. Assuming that money is not an issue for a new student, would you advise that student to seek an assistantship or fellowship anyway?

Yes _____ No _____ Why or why not? _____

19. Should work or service be required: (Please answer a,b,and c)

a. Of all graduate students	Yes	No	No Opinion
b. Those holding an assistantship	Yes	No	No Opinion
c. Those holding a fellowship	Yes	No	No Opinion

20. If you answered yes to any or all parts of Question 19 above, is it imperative that the work/service be in the degree program area?

Yes _____ No _____ No Opinion _____

Spring 1994

Dear UB Graduate:

Enclosed is a questionnaire which three UB faculty members have developed as part of a research project attempting to assess your overall Graduate School experience at the University at Buffalo. We are primarily interested in exploring the relationship(s), if any, between your experiences and outcomes to offers of graduate financial support such as graduate assistantships and fellowships.

Not every respondent will have sought financial assistance or held an assistantship or fellowship; others will have relied heavily on several such opportunities while in Graduate School.

The experiences of all graduates will help us determine the type, amount, and optimal sequencing of financial assistance to support graduate students at UB.

Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, stamped envelope. Be assured that your responses are confidential.

Sincerely,

William Barba
Jeffrey Dutton
Maria Runfola
Charles Border (graduate
student)



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS



This document is covered by a signed “Reproduction Release (Blanket)” form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a “Specific Document” Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either “Specific Document” or “Blanket”).